



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,862	11/30/2000	Stephen E. Greco	00750414BA	3056

7590

07/09/2002

JOSEPH P. ABATE
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION
DEPT. 18G/BLDG. 300-482
2070 ROUTE 52
HOPEWELL JUNCTION, NY 12533

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, JOSEPH H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2815

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2002

//

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/725,862

Applicant(s)

GRECO ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph Nguyen

Art Unit

2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27-33 and 36-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-33 and 36-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 28, 37 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 28 recites the limitation "said oxidized FOX layer" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since the so-called oxidized FOX layer was not previously referred in claim 27 from which claim 28 depends.

Claim 37 recites the limitation "said thin layer of plasma-formed oxide" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since the so-called thin layer of plasma-formed oxide was not previously referred in claim 27 from which claim 28 depends.

Claim 44 recites the limitation "said conductive barrier layer" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since the so-called conductive barrier layer was not previously referred in claim 43 from which claim 44 depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2815

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 27, 31-33, 36-41, 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawanoue et al.

Regarding claim 27, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 an integrated circuit semiconductor device including a substrate having a substrate surface, a flowable oxide insulator (FOX) layer 161 upon said substrate surface, a trough 165 in said flowable oxide insulator layer, sidewalls of said flowable oxide insulator layer, a primary protective layer 163 on said sidewalls of said flowable oxide insulator layer, said primary protective layer being a thin oxidized surface of said FOX, said thin surface layer preventing the exposure of said flowable oxide insulator layer to moisture and lithographic resist developers, said primary protective layer being substantially impervious to copper extrusion, and a secondary protective layer 164 on said primary protective layer and on said substrate surface, said secondary protective layer being electrically conductive.

Art Unit: 2815

Regarding claim 31, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 a nitride supplemental protective layer 166 on said primary protective layer for improving adhesion with a metallic conductor.

Regarding claim 32, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 said primary layer is a barrier layer.

Regarding claim 33, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 said primary protective layer 163 on said sidewalls of said flowable insulator 161 has a thickness equal to or less than 20% of thickness of said flowable oxide insulator layer (col. 20, line 63 and col. 21, lines 24-25).

Regarding claim 36, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 said supplemental protective layer 166 is a nitride layer.

Regarding claim 37, as best the Examiner is able to ascertain to examine the claimed invention, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 said thin layer of plasma formed oxide has a thickness not exceeding about 500 Å.

Regarding claim 38, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 an integrated circuit including a layer of flowable oxide insulator 161, and a thin protective layer 163 thereon, said thin protective layer being an oxidized surface layer of said flowable oxide insulator that is resistant to moisture and lithographic resist developers.

Regarding claim 39, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 said thin oxidized layer 161 has a thickness less than about 500 Å (col. 21, lines 24-25).

Regarding claim 40, the claim limitation is merely the product by process and therefore not given patentable weight.

Art Unit: 2815

Regarding claim 41, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 a nitride or oxide nitride layer 166 on said thin oxidized surface layer 163.

Regarding claim 43, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 a conductive layer 164 on said thin oxidized surface layer 163.

Regarding claim 44, as best the Examiner is able to ascertain to examine the claimed invention, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 a metal conductor 165 in contact with said conductive barrier layer 164.

Regarding claim 45, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 said metal conductor 165 contains copper.

Regarding claim 46, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 said conductive barrier layer 164 includes a refractory metal or alloy.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawanoue et al as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Lopatin et al.

Regarding claim 28, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 substantially all the structure set forth in the claimed invention except an oxide layer upon said oxidized FOX layer. However, Lopatin et al discloses on figure 2 an oxide layer 108 upon said oxidized FOX layer 116. In view of such teaching, it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2815

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kawanoue et al by having an oxide layer upon said oxidized FOX layer for the purpose of effectively establishing the electrical interconnects in the integrated circuit semiconductor device.

Claims 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawanoue et al and Lopatin et al as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Yew et al.

Regarding claims 29 and 30, Kawanoue et al and Lopatin et al disclose substantially all the structure set forth in the claimed invention except the integrated circuit semiconductor device comprising a second damascene layer. Note that the second damascene layer is merely duplication of the first damascene layer of claim 27. However, Yew et al discloses on figure 2E the second damascene layer 226, 212 similar to the first damascene layer 222, 204. In view of such teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kawanoue et al and Lopatin et al by having the second damascene layer similar to the first damascene layer in the integrated circuit semiconductor device. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Kawanoue et al and Lopatin et al in the manner described for the purpose of having a reduced parasite capacitance in the dielectric layers, thus assuring the performance of an IC device (col. 3, line 15-18).

Claims 42, 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawanoue et al as applied to claim 46 above, and further in view of Usami.

Art Unit: 2815

Regarding claims 42 and 47, Kawanoue et al discloses on figure 24 substantially all the structure set forth in the claimed invention except the layer of flowable oxide insulator being located between two non-coplanar metal layers. However, Usami discloses on figure 1 the layer of flowable oxide insulator 4 being located between two non-coplanar metal layers 3. In view of such teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art at the time the invention was made to modify Kawanoue et al by having the layer of flowable oxide insulator being located between two non-coplanar metal layers for the purpose of effectively establishing the electrical interconnects within the integrated circuit device.

Regarding claim 48, Kawanoue et al and Usami together disclose the structure of claim 48.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 27-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-1269. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30 am- 4:30 pm

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on (703) 308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7382 for regular communications.

Art Unit: 2815

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

JN

June 28, 2002



EDDIE LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800